UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Reinhold Niebuhr and Liberal Religion - - - - - - - *Gardner Williams*

Reflections upon Intermarriage - - - - - - - - *Karl M. Chworowsky*

Toward World Government - - - - - - - - - *Charles E. Geiger*

What Do We Mean by the Word "Spiritual"? - - - - - - - *Alfred Stiernotte*

1946: The Grand Epilogue of Our Age - - - - - - - - *David Jobman*

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS

VOLUME CXXXII NUMBER 4

Chicago, June, 1946

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly
Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50
Single Copies 15 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Edwin T. Buehrer: Minister of the Third Unitarian Church, Chicago, Illinois.

Karl M. Chworowsky: Minister of The Fourth Unitarian Congregational Church in Brooklyn, New York.

Charles E. Geiger: Formerly with the Veterans Administration; now a practicing psychoanalyst.

Randall S. Hilton: Executive Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference.

David Jobman: Contributor to various anthologies of modern verse; author of "America's Marching Song of 1941," appearing in *The Book of Modern Poetry,* 1941.

Alfred Stiernotte: Minister of the First Unitarian Church, Vancouver, B. C., Canada.

Gardner Williams: Professor of Philosophy, University of Toledo.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE 51

ARTICLES—
- Reinhold Niebuhr and Liberal Religion—GARDNER WILLIAMS .. 52
- Reflections upon Intermarriage—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 55
- Toward World Government—CHARLES E. GEIGER 56
- What Do We Mean by the Word "Spiritual"?—ALFRED STIERNOTTE 57
- 1946: The Grand Epilogue of Our Age—DAVID JOBMAN 60

THE STUDY TABLE—
- Man's Ultimate Challenge—EDWIN T. BUEHRER 62
- Gloomy and Foreboding—RANDALL S. HILTON 63

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 64

THE FIELD—
- A Woman's Manifesto for Zero Hour—*Executive Committee of the National Council of Women of the United States, Inc.* 50

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

A Woman's Manifesto for Zero Hour

This is the Woman's Hour. It is the Hour of Destiny for which Woman, through the ages, has struggled and wept and prayed. And now, in this Year I of a new atomic age, it has struck, challenging Woman to seize her long-awaited opportunity before it is too late.

It comes at a fateful time when all humanity lies huddled in fear at the brink of a bottomless abyss. The curtain has fallen on a hideous epoch during which society, directed by only half the human family, has recorded its unhappy history in the blood of countless millions and the tears of women who have borne the brunt of war in every century. The testimony of man's failure to find the road to peace is there for all to read; it says unmistakably that, having failed to solve the problem of wiping out wars, men have been driven inevitably to use instead ingenuity to increase their terror and ferocity. Viewing the cold facts from the broad perspective of history, it becomes obvious that the human lust for power, selfishness, greed, and the principle of "might makes right" have prevailed as the dynamic of successive generations. And women, standing on the sidelines, powerless to act, frantically have had to reknit the web of civilization as each new war rent its fabric; but never were they permitted to use their ingenuity and impose their will to strengthen the fibre so as to make it impervious to attack.

But today, all of us, we members of the human family, wherever we may live on the earth's surface—women and men, savage and civilized, colored and white, atheist and disciple of religion—share the common threat of complete destruction in a man-made inferno. And at long last, women, liberated, the world around, may speak out and give full expression to their natural role of peacemaker and protector; they may raise their voices in behalf of law and order and security, and against the machinations which lead to war.

Ironically, even as the Hour of Destiny ticks away the moments which will decide whether we are to survive, or perish miserably, Woman falters, chained by the inhibitions created in her through the centuries. She has become conditioned to the idea of being the passive observer, not the initiator, of bold plans for the good of humanity. She has been trained to shrink away from "politics" as something socially unacceptable to her sex; to accept meekly the status quo of living in a world ruled by men.

However, to participate in government is not "politics," with all that word has come to imply. It can and will be elevated to the level of statesmanship of the highest order; that statesmanship, in fact, which alone can lead us toward a golden age of atomic energy, harnessed for humanitarian welfare, instead of for

(*Continued on page 63*)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXXII JUNE, 1946 No. 4

EDITORIAL

The Advance Movement among Unitarians could make much more rapid progress if a small minority would come to understand that the genius of Unitarian history and the temper of Unitarianism today are definitely in accord with the free mind principle. Such understanding would put them at ease, and save their energies for Advance. To convert the Unitarian Movement into a Christian sect is impossible and undesirable. There are and should be Christian Unitarians; and they have the same rights and privileges as Theist Unitarians or Humanist Unitarians—the same, but no more. The only possible way for a church of the free mind to get along harmoniously is for its members and especially its clergy to take the free mind principle seriously, and not be disturbed over differences in theological opinions. This should be easy, since most people have changed their minds on many important subjects; and they should at least leave the way open for further change. At best, a theological revolution is only a change of mind on the part of some theologian or group of theologians. It would be helpful to some of our brethren to remember that they once held views radically different from those they now hold. Robert B. Day should recall that not long ago Felix Adler was his prophet and that *An Ethical Philosophy of Life* was his Bible. It should not be difficult for Edwin Ohrenstein to remember—for it was only yesterday—that he was once a left-wing Humanist; and Clarence Petrie should have no difficulty in recalling that he once believed in apostolic succession. Of course people change their minds. And a free religious movement must as a matter of course give full leeway for such change. There are no beliefs that are forever binding on a free mind. That the Unitarian church is unique in its recognition of the free mind principle should be accepted as a fact and extolled as a virtue.

In liberal religious circles there is great need of clear and rigorous thinking on theological matters. This is especially so because of the new language in which the liberal clergy finds itself defining or describing theology. There was a time when theology was the science that dealt with the being and nature of God. Today it is commonplace to hear liberals describe theology as hard, clear thinking about existence, or about man's relation to the universe; or as the orderly arrangement of the values by which we live. The function of theology in our time may be fairly accurately described as the discovery, the analysis, the ordering, and the evaluation of the beliefs by which men live. The trouble comes when liberal clergymen use such language as this to describe theology and then proceed to insist that the theological process arrive at a particular content and that particular symbols be used to designate the content. Such confusion must be due to failure on the part of liberal clergymen to examine clearly and rigorously the presuppositions of their description of theology. This may be due to lack of philosophical discipline, or it may be just careless thinking. But surely when theology is thought of as a process, not as a body of doctrine, it follows that there will be great diversity in the content of the conclusions arrived at by equally competent persons. This is precisely what one finds in any group of modern-minded theologians. It is distressing when one finds liberal ministers "taking to heart" differences in theological opinions to an extent almost unheard of among present-day evangelical theologians. Let the liberal clergy look to its theological liberalism or it will find itself in an eddy while the moving stream of Modernist theology passes it by.

While I am in an ecclesiastical and theological mood, let me add a word of counsel to Humanists who are tempted to get too "chummy" with the universe. It is, of course, true that we are "of the universe," that we are "organic to the universe," that we come from its being and return to its depths. There are sweep and grandeur and beauty in the universe. And the universe has produced great minds and great souls. But it is equally true that there are some other things not so worthy of rapturous thought—things not here catalogued through deference to esthetic sensitivity—things that are also "of the universe" and "organic to the universe"; that come from its being and return to its depths. The ugly and the evil are also in the universe, as are little minds and vicious souls. The remnants of a discredited Pantheism should not find their way to a new vogue through the unguarded back door of humanistic mysticism.

CURTIS W. REESE.

Reinhold Niebuhr and Liberal Religion

GARDNER WILLIAMS

Mr. Niebuhr's attack on liberal religion is so brilliantly done, and seems impressive to so many people, that a careful analysis of his thought should be attempted. In order to reject some of his contentions it will only be necessary for many enlightened folk to understand clearly what he really means by them. And, in spite of his antipathy to human standards of value, some of the fundamental truths which he expounds will be seen to be essentially humanistic in nature. He has given us an imposing series of books which are a significant commentary on human affairs. His *An Interpretation of Christian Ethics* is probably the best summary of his thought.

Mr. Niebuhr is deeply impressed with the impossibility of living harmoniously by human intelligence, that is, by Humanism. Reason, trying to bring order into the expression of the natural major interests, is doomed to failure. David Hume, John Dewey, and liberal Protestantism, all relying on reason, are on the wrong track. If our ideas are oriented by humanistic, rationalistic, and naturalistic principles, Mr. Niebuhr believes that we shall all become spiritually bankrupt. We shall lose all poise and serenity. We shall never come anywhere near hitting the golden mean. We shall be distracted by conflicts and fears. We shall become neurotics. We shall shift back and forth between "alternate moods of sentimentality and despair, trusting human powers too much in one moment and losing all faith in the meaning of life when we discover the limits of human possibilities." When life is interpreted humanistically ". . . moral striving generates a stinking sweat of self-righteousness and an alternation of fanatic illusions and fretful disillusionments."

The trouble with man is that he is just naturally depraved. For dignity and honor and general excellence he must look to the supernatural. "The ultimate moral demands upon man . . . can be affirmed only in terms of . . . a divine reality which transcends human experience. The order of human existence is too imperiled by chaos, the goodness of man too corrupted by sin, and the possibilities of man too obscured by natural handicaps, to make human order and human virtue and human possibilities solid bases of the moral imperative." Man must "cease to make the standards of a sinful existence the norms of life."

Absolute moral imperatives, then, are supernatural in origin. The chief one is love. Love divine, called *agapē,* is an utter and an uncoerced giving of the self to others. It is complete self-abnegation. But we are offered no evidence, except revelation, that *agapē* is the highest ethical principle. Mr. Niebuhr simply accepts, without criticism, the tradition which sets love on a pinnacle. And he depends on the same tradition, and on his own eloquence, to win acceptance for his contentions.

Moreover, he holds that men are incapable of practicing this principle of love divine; and he recommends, somewhat paradoxically, that they shall not practice it. "Short of the transmutation of this world into the Kingdom of God, men will always confront enemies. . . . Forgiveness in the absolute sense is therefore an impossibility. . . ." Furthermore, "The law of love is . . . not a norm of history, in the sense that historical experience justifies it. Historical experience justifies more complex social strategies in which the self, individual and collective, seeks both to preserve its life and to relate it harmoniously to other selves." Mr. Niebuhr recommends that we live by these strategies for the sake of self-preservation and mutual harmony; that is, he recommends that we live by certain humanistic principles. He approves of the use of force and violence in the interest of self-assertion whenever practical reason calls for it. He reproves the democratic countries for their tardiness in uniting to fight the Axis powers. "No view of history *sub specie aeternitatis* dare beguile us from our historical obligations." And he says that "society must punish criminals, or at least quarantine them. . . ." Also ". . . the relativity of all moral ideals [he means human ones] cannot absolve us of the necessity and duty of choosing between relative values." Tolstoy's attempt to practice divine love in Russia was futile. *Agapē* is not practical.

There are, then, two moralities, an absolute divine one and a relative humanistic one. Both are genuinely authoritative. *Agapē* is an absolute norm, and also we have a duty to choose between relative values, presumably being obligated to select that one which will be greater in the long run, even when it is counter to *agapē*. Niebuhr urges us actually to live by the relative humanistic standard. He points out that we must live by this if we are to live at all. But the absolute one alone has absolute validity! This is a contradiction, as judged by human logic. We must submit to contradiction and accept both contradictories by faith. A consistent philosophy ". . . cannot do justice to all the facts of a paradoxical reality. The canons of logic and rationality are transcended when reason attempts to comprehend the final irrationality of things." ". . . man's life remains self contradictory in its sin, no matter how high human culture rises. . . ." Only God can resolve man's contradictions, and He will resolve all of them in His Infinite Nature.

Mr. Niebuhr is very clear about the superiority of supernatural love-morality over natural humanistic morality. "The rightness of the Kingdom of God stands above it [man's relative rightness] and condemns it." "The law of the Kingdom of God is the law of life, even though men cannot maintain themselves in the world of sin by obedience to it." "God's word is spoken against all nations . . . a divine word of judgment [is] spoken against the whole human enterprise, by faith." Moreover, this superior supernatural morality must be kept in mind, even though nobody ever ought actually to live by it, because if it is ignored the humanistic morality which we live by will degenerate into humanistic immorality. ". . . strategies of mutual [human] love and of systems of [human] justice cannot maintain themselves without inspiration from a deeper dimension of history. A strategy of brotherhood which has no other resource but historical experience degenerates from mutuality to a prudent regard for the interests of the self, and from the impulse toward community to an acceptance of the survival impulse as ethically normative." Apparently the interest in self-preservation is one of the lowest forms of immorality! And the only thing that can save man from this, we are told, is the

admission of the absolute validity, supernaturally guaranteed, of the impractical principle of a perfect love that is utter self-abnegation. Apparently Mr. Niebuhr's strategy is, at least in part, to preach one extreme, which he recognizes as being in itself folly, in the hope of drawing men away from the other extreme, so as to strike the golden mean.

If this were really the only way to get people to hit the golden mean and to live humanistically or humanely, it would of course be justified in a practical way. But with many rational and enlightened folk it is not really necessary. It is not even a good way of arriving at the mean. When intelligent people discover that their preceptor does not really intend that they shall practice what he preaches, they are not likely to be influenced by it beyond being slightly antagonized.

There is doubtless another reason why Mr. Niebuhr insists on the conflict of divine and human morality and on the superiority of the former and on the importance of actually practicing the latter. He is trying to convince people that they ought always to have bad consciences. He seems to desire that they should always suffer from remorse. He tries to prove that every rational and forceful and determined participation in human affairs is incurably sinful. All self-assertion is wicked. Even in men's noblest undertakings, he says, or rather especially in these, men sin most profoundly. And he wants them always to realize this with great vividness because he wants them always to be repenting with contrite hearts. The worship of such a God, as Mr. Niebuhr pictures, who sets up an impossible rule of love as an absolute duty, "leads to contrition, not merely to a contrite recognition of the conscious sins of pride and arrogance which the human spirit commits, but the sense of guilt for the inevitable and inescapable pride involved in every human enterprise, even the highest and most perfect, or, more correctly, particularly in the highest and noblest human enterprise." Christianity, as Mr. Niebuhr interprets it, "imparts a sense of contrition not only for moral derelictions but for the unconscious sins involved in the most perfect moral achievements." We must "recognize the unjustified pretensions of all human spirituality." ". . . the highest expression of human spirituality, therefore, contains also the subtlest form of sin."

Mr. Niebuhr admits, at least by implication, that he himself is sinning when he tells the world in his books and lectures what he thinks is the real truth about the nature of man and of God. But he indicates that grace enters and purifies his thought since he recognizes the conflict between the absolute divine law and the natural self-assertion involved in trying to tell the real truth, universally valid, about anything. His public utterances are permissible so long as he admits their sinfulness and repents with deep contrition. Also, he says, this repentance and contrition enable him to forgive those who contend against his version of the truth.

The desire to keep men feeling sinful and contrite all the time is related to ecclesiasticism. There are two ways of getting people to support ecclesiastical institutions. One is to make them feel sinful. The other is to teach important truths in church which intelligent people will be glad to find out about. Mr. Niebuhr leans heavily on the former method, even as St. Augustine did. If people are always downhearted about the state of their souls they are more likely to keep coming around on Sunday for spiritual support and uplift.

Furthermore, Mr. Niebuhr leaves no doubt as to *which* churches he thinks people ought to turn to. Christianity is the best religion. Buddhism is the second best. And some kinds of Christianity are better than others. He points to certain features of Catholicism, especially to the absolute authority which is supposed to reside in official pronouncements by the pope, which seem to disqualify it. Also liberal Protestantism is sentimental and impractical. Its "appeals to the moral will and [its] . . . effort to support the moral will by desperate hopes are politically as unrealistic as they are religiously superficial." The only thing left is orthodox Protestantism, in the service of whose institutions Mr. Niebuhr is now having such a distinguished career.

The other way to get people to support ecclesiastical institutions, as noted above, is for those institutions to teach the truth, to provide genuine spiritual insights which are in accord with truth, and to give wise practical guidance. This is the better way with enlightened and educated people. Frightening folks into coming to church should be used only if nothing else will do. It must be used when people are very ignorant and when their thinking approximates the primitive. It has been used historically, as by St. Augustine, on slavish populations with marked success and with great benefits to civilization. But many people in the West, and in parts of the East, are now getting to a higher cultural stage where it will not work so well. Mr. Niebuhr does not seem to think that men can really rise to this new stage, and he does not seem to want them to do so.

Also his view of God is a matter of considerable interest. He does not conceive of God as a being who would be very likely to inspire sensible people with great confidence in the divine commands. Genuine moral obligation, we have seen above, is, according to Mr. Niebuhr, whatever God wishes or commands. And God establishes the absolute moral law of love by His authority. But then, we are told, He does not live up to it any more than men do. He is said, by Mr. Niebuhr, to be extremely jealous. Apparently He objects strenuously to men's pretentious efforts to perform functions which He regards as belonging peculiarly to Himself. ". . . a jealous God metes out [punishments] to those who overleap their mortal state to claim equality with the divine." God's ways are not our ways. We should not emulate Him. And then, since He regards self-assertion as His own special prerogative, it is obvious that man is hopelessly sunk in sin every time he does anything. All human self-assertion is condemned as pride and arrogance, according to Mr. Niebuhr. Even the noblest human enterprises, as we have seen, inevitably involve the pride and guilt of self-assertion.

We are told that God's vindictiveness and jealousy are shown in the cyclical rise and fall of great civilizations. He has built up imposing nations and empires, and, then, surprised and incensed at their arrogant claims to universal domination, He has struck them down, the good with the bad—His majesty being exhibited both in building them up and in striking them down. Mr. Niebuhr does not ascribe to God those qualities, usually associated with a good executive, of foresight and rational control of the passions, and the ability to make allowances for the weaknesses of subordinates, and the habit of never demanding what is impossible. Greek reasonableness seems to be as foreign to the nature of the God whom Mr. Niebuhr conjures

up as it is to Mr. Niebuhr's own ultimate ideal.

Also, Mr. Niebuhr thinks that it is God, not nature, which has made man much more obnoxious than the lower animals. The animals have less of the divine in them, and, therefore, when they fight, it is mostly defensively. But men are the children of God. They touch the fringes of eternity. They have a God-given extra vitality, and a God-given reason which tells them that aggression is the best defense. This is what makes them so obnoxious, and supposedly it is why God has to be opposed to the whole human enterprise. If all this were really so, one wonders why God ever pushed evolution beyond the ape level,—or why he ever allowed it to move on beyond that point under its own power.

In spite of all these sensational theological and ethical principles, Mr. Niebuhr has an important message to his generation. He expresses certain illusion-shattering truths which people need to know, and which some could not learn except in the form of such fantastic symbols as he uses.

He tells men, what is true, that they will be involved in conflicts as long as they live and that pure love is impractical. Anyone who expects to bring perfect harmony into the soul of man or into human society is deluding himself. Man cannot live without doing some evil. There is always a bit of sin in life.

Another true principle in Mr. Niebuhr's writings is that of individualistic relativism. "Logically" he says "every life deserves destruction. Since it is predatory either individually or collectively, it ought to die at the hands of those it has exploited." Of course this is not really logic. It is relativism and it is self-defense and it is vindictiveness. And possibly he exaggerates the penalty which is due. But Mr. Niebuhr here gives us the truth that we all have victims and that we all are wrong from their points of view. Some who would not learn this important truth from others will learn it from him.

Also he expresses a profound truth when he says that "without repentance those who have created peace through their power imagine that they have created pure peace; and suffer from the delusion that the enemies of their peace are God's enemies." He might have added that even with repentance this sometimes holds true.

Furthermore, Mr. Niebuhr says truly that love and harmony are valid ideals. We should recognize that their moral significance, in the light of human experience, is tremendous. And, as he indicates, we shall never attain them fully in practice. Like all other valid ideals, they cannot be perfectly achieved. But these facts, that they are valid, that their validity rests on human experience, and that their actualization will always be imperfect, will not, contrary to Mr. Niebuhr's contentions, make most normal people very panicky. Folks who have not been nourished on illusion, or who have been and have got over it, can contemplate a degree of human imperfection as well as the human and natural basis of all ideals and standards of perfection, without spiritual hysterics and without losing their faith in the validity and significance of these ideals.

It is worth-while to note how humanistic Mr. Niebuhr is in certain fundamentals. He values spiritual security, relaxation, peace, serenity, sanity, wholeness and dignity. He promises these to all who will accept his gospel and live by it. All of these qualities of mind are, of course, natural intrinsic goods. He does not claim them as the ultimate justification of his system, but one feels that he would not be advocating his system if he did not think that it would produce these or similar goods. And the truth is that if, as he claims, these goods could be secured through his system better than in any other way, and without the sacrifice of any other good whose value was greater than theirs, they would justify his system morally, however false it might be in its theories. So far as it produces these goods, they are in fact all the human justification which it possesses.

Also Mr. Niebuhr is humanistically sound in his recognition that man's nature is good in its ultimate essence, and that man's highest good is the fulfillment of this essential nature. This nature sometimes seems to be his infinite, eternal, and transcendent nature, not his finite, temporal one. The latter is almost though not quite wholly depraved. But at times it would seem to be his finite nature whose fulfillment is his highest good. Possibly the depravity of his finite nature consists chiefly in its inability to find adequate expression for itself, rather than in any evil which would inhere in it should it succeed in finding such expression. Finite man is, of course, utterly incompetent to arrange for his own self-expression. For him to attempt this is sinful. But God will do it for him. Human contradictions, "which man cannot wholly surmount, are swallowed up in the life of God Himself." ". . . the Kingdom of God is not some realm of eternity which negates time. It is a realm of eternity which fulfills time." "Time" here probably means human activities occurring in time. "The basic plan of life cannot be finally defeated." In the crucifixion "God has absorbed the contradictions of historic existence into Himself." And ". . . divine omnipotence . . . will complete his [man's] life without destroying its essential nature." "The fulfillment of life . . . is possible only through the mercy of God." Note that here the supernatural is treated chiefly as a means to an end which is fixed by man's nature. This really implies that the final authority of moral standards is human!

Another humanistic element, to which we have already referred, is his recommendation that people sin continually in asserting themselves intelligently in practical ways for the sake of survival and of mutual cooperation. Even though he calls it sin he still says that it is their duty. True, he wants them always to feel a bit reluctant about it, and to feel remorseful and contrite afterwards. He wants them to admit that it is sinful. But to his credit he does urge them to do it. And he really thinks that their feelings of sin and contrition will genuinely help them to do it better and more consistently and more satisfactorily; for with contrition they will, he thinks, find a spiritual joy and serenity which can be had in no other way and which is absolutely essential for the dignity and the stability of life.

Still another humanistic aspect of Mr. Niebuhr's philosophy is its practical propaganda effect, probably deliberate, of giving support to an institution, orthodox Protestantism, which does in fact serve in large measure the needs of millions of human beings.

Thus, in conclusion, I feel that a study of his writings confirms the view which I stated at the beginning of this paper, that in order to reject some of his basic contentions it will only be necessary for many enlightened people to understand clearly what he really means by them. And, in spite of his antipathy to human standards of value, some of the fundamental truths which he expounds are seen to be essentially humanistic in nature.

Reflections upon Intermarriage

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY

I know of no issue involved in the general problem of race relations the discussion of which so completely exposes the perversity and hypocrisy of the white man's mind as does the issue of intermarriage. One hardly expects logic, reasonableness, and decent human considerations to govern the white man's thinking on such subjects as economic disabilities, political disfranchisement, and social ostracism as practised against the Negro; but it is when you approach the question of marriage between Negro and white that the full impact of white stupidity, arrogance, and dishonesty smites you.

The argument is usually started by some white sahib with the mind of the traditional southern colonel, posing this question with cunning suddenness: But you do not believe in intermarriage, do you? And if the person thus addressed is caught off guard and begins mumbling some half-hearted apology for even giving the impression that he might harbor so terrible a thought, the inevitable sequitur is: And how would you feel if your sister or daughter married a Negro? This question is supposed to apply the *coup de grace* to anyone so utterly uncivilized, unfeeling, and low-brow as to imagine that any other answer *could* be given than a shocked "of course not!" Should, however, the unthinkable happen and someone suggest that after all intermarriage is simply another and somewhat more complicated aspect of marriage and that a discussion of its legitimacy and propriety should not be confused with irrelevant issues of color and race, the person so reckless as to make these observations will be put down at once as an individual of perverse sexual habits, or as a traitor to the Aryan race (where is it?), or as a Communist, if not all three.

I am never more ashamed of my race than when I hear the average white man and woman discuss intermarriage; there are, of course, exceptions, but these are so rare that they but emphasize the rule which is that when whites dilate upon intermarriage between their race and the colored races they utterly forsake reason and logic, forget science and history, disregard morality and religion, and enjoy a Roman Holiday of prejudice and animosity that beggars description. What Mr. White Man seems to forget in his discussion of intermarriage is how completely lacking in ordinary intelligence, how thoroughly devoid of historical perspective, how utterly ignorant of scientific knowledge and relevant facts, how hopelessly unimaginative and irreligious and shamefully hypocritical he is. Of course, his unpardonably stupid attitude towards intermarriage is only part and parcel of his usual inclination towards bias and prejudice in the whole matter of race relations. He has made up his mind that a white God has created the white race to lord it over all other races; and any intimation that he may be wrong in this approach to a great human problem he resents as a personal insult.

If Mr. White Man used his God-given intelligence towards solving the vexing problem of race relations he would know that as long as civilization has existed on this planet people have practiced intermarriage; he would also know that science has little to say about intermarriage that it does not say about the general proposition of marriage. Surely he should know that the social sciences do not grant the validity of such concepts as "pure blood," "pure race," or "superior race." On the contrary, scientists seem pretty well agreed that by and large intermarriage has proved a blessing to mankind rather than a curse and that the only thing that matters in intermarriage is what matters in any marriage, viz., that the individuals involved be well-mated and enjoy physical and mental health. Indeed, there are other problems as well, problems that are bound to be aggravated in the case of intermarriage. Such aggravation is not caused by any considerations of "pure" blood or "better" race or any other similar nonsense, but simply by the fact that human ignorance and prejudice have laid a taboo upon intermarriage that is about as reasonable and logical as any other antiquated superstition and baseless bias of which the white man's culture carries so ample a stock. The issue involved in intermarriage is not fundamentally one of race at all; it is one of social adaptation and personal orientation. When the element of race and color is stressed, the issue becomes confused and its social implications unnecessarily complicated. As in the case of all important personal problems, let little minds approach the subject of intermarriage with their warped viewpoint and their picayune considerations and the whole matter is lifted out of the realm of clear thinking and reasonable solution into the cloudy regions of emotionalism and petty selfishness. From the historico-scientific point of view, intermarriage is but another phase of marriage, and to treat it as something *per se* and utterly different is to deny a solution before even attempting to find one.

What a pity that our churches have failed to rise to their opportunity of implementing their gospel of Brotherhood with moral action and social purpose. If they had the courage of their convictions they would speak forth both wisely and boldly upon the issue of intermarriage, and the world would be the better for it. But as long as even the churches either explicitly proclaim or tacitly support the ancient hoax of white supremacy and Aryan superiority, just so long will the whole problem of race relations continue to plague us, and intermarriage will remain what it is: a relationship few will dare to undertake and an area of social relations whose very discussion calls forth bigotry and fanatical demagoguery instead of calm speech and reasonable consideration.

The white man's attitude towards intermarriage is also as hopelessly and blatantly hypocritical as it is stupid and prejudiced. Reading the frequent diatribes that issue from the pens of editors and the rostrums of politicians, hearing the usual pious mouthings of the run-of-the-mill parson on this theme, one would think that intermarriage had become a terrible threat to the unique and distinctive mission and character of the white populace of this globe. I expect to see one of these days a publication rivaling the idiotic pretensions of the infamous *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* put forth to prove that there is a world conspiracy on foot, engineered and sponsored by the colored peoples of the world, for the purpose of invading the sanctity of the white home and through intermarriage to pollute the "pure" bloodstream of Aryan nations and to "mongrelize" the great and glorious world of the white sahib. This is the impression you get when you hear our Rankins and Bilbos and Eastlands speak about the Negro; this is what you can still read in many of our

newspapers and even hear from certain pulpits. "The white race is endangered by intermarriage! White men and women, rally to the defense of the lily-white purity of your altars and your sires! Fight every attempt to pollute the blood stream of the race, and stand against any effort of 'Reds' and 'radicals' that preach racial equality and the brotherhood of man!"

The problem of intermarriage can be settled if approached on the level of scientific objectivity, social morality, true religion, and strict honesty. So far none of these have been allowed to play a major role in trying to solve the problem, and if today our minds are disturbed, if peoples' lives are warped, and if ideas and ideals remain blurred and confused it is only because we have allowed ancient fears, antiquated prejudices, and outworn mores to haunt and depress us. A little straight thinking and a little forthright courage will go a long way to help set things right.

I believe in full economic and political equality for the Negro; I believe in intermarriage as a natural consequence of any normal liberalizing of the relations between the races, and I think it is as inevitable in the fulfillment of any program of democratic society and free fellowship as is marriage between the members of any given racial or social group. I know also that to proclaim the principle of justice involved in intermarriage is one thing and to assure its practical application in human society is another. But I also believe that the proper *modus operandi* can, must, and will be found. Having learned to face honestly and fearlessly the fundamental implications of the larger problem of racial equality and human brotherhood, we shall not find the task insuperable that confronts us when we seek to make marriage between members of different racial groups as normal and natural a thing as God has destined it to be. I do not say that the solution of the problem is an easy one. I do say that for earnest men and women of all races working together for the enrichment of the pattern of our common humanity and for the extension of liberty in every area of human existence no task is too hard and no dream impossible of fulfillment.

Toward World Government

CHARLES E. GEIGER

Peace, and how to maintain it, is the most important subject under discussion in the world today. Many political schemes and panaceas have been tried and suggested, yet somehow we are muddling along in morbid dread and fear of another war more terrible than the last. We seem to lack confidence in our ability to establish and maintain peace in spite of our hopes for peace.

From whence come these hopes and fears? From whence come the multitude of complexes and emotions that govern our lives? The answer must be that since all human conduct is related to "mind" it is the mind and its evolution that is directly involved in the present world social situation.

Modern psychologists agree that mind, or that part of the human body which makes it a conscious animated being, is the product of evolutionary development and growth.

A newborn babe has no consciouness or memory. It is like a blank phonograph record. The nerve-system with its complicated divisions of sensory, motor, and autonomic nerves connected to a series of ganglia and the brain is the instrument through which conscious mind is formed and used. From the very first moment after birth a constant recording of experiences takes place and this continues throughout life, gradually slowing up in old age. Thus, the individual mind is the result of the sum total of past human experience plus present experience. How the individual mind is developed depends upon several conditions, such as hereditary influences, present condition of health, and means and methods of absorbing experiences, both past and present. Every act carried out by an individual or group will bring about a corresponding reaction on the part of other individuals or groups and will to a certain extent influence or modify the action or conduct of others. Thus we find the mass conduct of the human species directly related to "mind." The human mind is a dual one composed of the conscious and subconscious. In simple language, conscious mind is that part which is in use at the present moment giving us an awareness of our existence: our surrounding environment and external phenomena; while the subconscious mind is that part which has stored past experiences that may be remembered or recalled by several methods, such as association of ideas, incidents, and so forth.

The process of evolution or "creation" of man is twofold. Physically, man has developed from a simple homogeneous cell structure to an ever more heterogeneous or diversified existence. It is this diversification that makes possible the many activities in our present highly mechanized civilization. Socially, man developed from a state of disintegration to ever larger integrated units. From primitive nomadic tribes, man found it to his advantage to merge into larger units, such as the state. This gave him the added security of superior numbers against a common enemy. Religion, too, was found to accomplish more through organized effort. So with all other human efforts. Man is a gregarious animal and constantly seeks to organize and merge his efforts with others of his kind. To some extent this is true also of the lower animals. All this is the result of experience registered upon the human mind, for it is by experience that man has had to learn right from wrong, good from evil.

This process of integration has continued until today we find the world divided into great empires. Religious organizations are constantly merging their efforts and ideals while labor organizes into unions for mutual protection and benefit. By nature, man is an organizer. History is a written record of this fact. We have given a brief synopsis of the experiences of man leading up to the present. What is the next step in the psycho-genetic evolution of man?

The next step of human integration is toward an ultimate united world government. This is possible through the development of world communication with ever-increasing speed. Without the physical develop-

ment of radio, telephone, airplane, and other communication devices and the diversified trades involved we could not establish a world government. It is this modern human achievement that makes us universal-brotherhood conscious. This is the result of experience modifying past conditioning.

To be sure, this universal brotherhood will have a crude beginning, like all other human achievements, but it will grow as time goes on, to an ever greater perfection and clarity. As the present world government consciousness is repeated over and over, it will transfer to the subconscious mind and become instinctive or "habitual." There never was a social, religious, moral, or political movement in past history which is not still reflected, in proportion to its prominence, to this day.

Let us draw an analogy. A man has a quart of pure white paint and adds a tablespoonful of red paint. The result is that the paint is neither pure white nor red. The white, however, predominates because of its greater bulk. The white represents past experience, while the red represents present experience. Subsequently, other colors such as green, blue, yellow, and so forth, can be added; each one in turn representing a new experience in the form of political, social, or moral movements and changing the sum total by the amount relative to the greater bulk of past experience, which still contains all the elements of past movements modified by subsequent movements. Such is psycho-genetic evolution.

We have made a good start toward universal mindedness and it is to be hoped that it will grow without the interruption of another war. As we grow in universal-brotherhood mindedness, we will develop a maturity of emotional feeling. Fear, anger, hate: all these are the result of primitive experiences. Inferiority and superiority complexes which induce childish exhibitionism and selfishness are likewise the result of primitive fatalism. It is time we begin to outgrow these and develop an emotional maturity based upon impersonal service of each for all and all for each.

As we move farther along this road to universal brotherhood and world government, we more and more sacrifice personal selfish "rights" to receive a greater spiritual freedom in the security of the whole united fellowship. A world government will free us from a multitude of worries and complications that now arise due to national barriers, racial differences, legal interpretations, and so forth.

A common belief in higher ideals, philosophies, and practices founded upon complete freedom of thought, together with a universal auxiliary language and standard medium of exchange, complete the picture. Fantastic? No! Just the natural course of man's evolutionary progress. To struggle against this gradual integration is like splitting the atom—it results in social and political explosions. Like our primitive ancestors who found it expedient to gather into larger groups in mutual defense against some common enemy, we too must gather together into a world fellowship in defense against our common enemy—war.

There will be plenty left to do in such a united world fellowship. However, it will be of a constructive nature rather than of a destructive nature. We can then concentrate on a struggle against disease, crime, immorality, maladjusted marriages, and assist in the rehabilitation and education of millions of persons, rebuilding the soil, our cities, and generally beautifying our surroundings. These and many more projects should keep mankind busy for centuries to come, with never a dull moment.

What Do We Mean by the Word "Spiritual"?

ALFRED STIERNOTTE

If there is one word in our vocabulary which is causing confusion worse confounded, it is this simple word "spiritual." It is a word which may be given so many different meanings that we do not know if it has any real, valid meaning. It is one of those weasel words which may even act as smokescreens behind which it is possible to hide our lack of perception or our lack of decision. We may claim to be moved by spiritual values, or by spiritual ideals. We may protest that we are impelled by a vision of spiritual things, as we hope they will be on this earth in some far distant future. But, again, what do we mean by the word spiritual in all these expressions?

Ministers are very fond of using the word spiritual, and of claiming that the spiritual is their special domain. It is said that when Emerson began to preach in New England, he would give rather intellectual sermons, as young ministers are apt to do, and if any of the younger ladies of the church were asked what Emerson had preached about, they would reply: "I'm sure I don't know, but he looks so very spiritual!"

And so we may easily perceive that the word spiritual has many meanings and varieties of meaning. Of course, we may say that this term expresses all the varieties of the religious life of man, all the idealism of man, all the self-sacrificing pursuits of man, and because of the wide range of its connotations, it is difficult to put our finger on some one aspect of life, and say with any degree of assurance: This is spiritual. Hence our confusion and difficulty, and our withdrawal into some sort of inner indulgence when we think of the word spiritual.

And yet we must come to grips with the meaning of this word, for it is impossible to labor under the idea that our religion can be real and vital, reaching down to the depths of our being, as long as the word spiritual is a vague term for us, a term expressing a sort of wishy-washy liberalism, which permits us to do anything we please, and believe anything we please, since the old fears of hell fire, and the ancient hopes for a heaven with streets of gold, have lost their terror and their charm for us. Before we can get to close grips with the word spiritual, let us clarify our vision by enumerating a few of the things it has meant in the past, and let us see for ourselves if we are satisfied with these meanings of the word passed on to us from the past.

Firit of all, when we think of what is spiritual, we usually think of a particular theology, as if by accepting this particular theology the believer is given automatic spiritual insight and values. This has been the great fault of Protestantism—the attempt to nail down the

spiritual life to a Procustes bed of theology and dogma.

Too long have men been told to believe that they can reach spiritual values by a complex theology. Too long has theology been the center of religion. In the seventeenth century, Oliver Cromwell led a rebellion against the divine right of kings, and ever since the British monarchy has been constitutional and democratic. We are now witnessing a similar revolt in religion, a rebellion against the divine right of theology, and some day in the near future, religion will become democratic and responsible to the will of the people, and not to some divine revelation possessed by one man or by one group.

Sometimes, the spiritual has been given a broader meaning than that of a particular theology. The liberal or Modernist Christian would say that the spiritual life is best exemplified in the best elements of the Christian religion. So far so good! But he would say that it is still valid for missionaries to go to India or China and teach the poor Buddhist or Confucianist or Taoist the pretended higher virtues of the Christian religion. This assumes that Buddhism and Confucianism and Taoism are inferior religions, outside the pale of Christian revelation, while in very truth these religions have a long and heroic history of their own.

Again, a third meaning of the word spiritual is given to the church as such. People may say that theology does not confine the limits of the spiritual, but they will say that the idea of a church does include all that we mean by the word spiritual. The Ecumenical movement has attempted to gather the various Protestant churches into some sort of reunion, but it is regrettable that this reunion has been creedal rather than practical. One of the great cries of the Ecumenical movement has been: "Let the church be the church!" The cry has been to buttress the church as such, the church as some mystical "bride of Christ," the church as some divinely ordained instrument which, because of this very divine ordination, is above criticism.

Now, the only difficulty with this exalted view of the church, is that it is a little late in the day to proclaim the church to be some infallible institution, or an institution which has been free from error in the past. People who labor under a strong sense of ecclesiasticism are too easily given to the idea that those outside the churches are deprived of spiritual values and can only therefore possess a false spirituality. Outside of the church, there is only error, science, tyranny, and that blessed word which is coming to the fore today: "secularism."

We have seen that the meaning of the word spiritual is not fully given, and is sometimes distorted, by any of several attitudes. The spiritual qualities of men cannot be confined within one particular theology; they cannot be confined within one particular church, for ecclesiasticism sometimes gets hold of a church and the results are such things as Spanish Inquisitions, or heresy trials, or catering to the desires and scruples of vested interests. Nor can the spiritual qualities of men even be associated with one religion alone, for there are great religions besides the Christian religion, and they claim devotees and martyrs truly as noble as those of the Christian religion. Nor is the spiritual to be perceived solely in table rappings or in spiritistic phenomena, under the guise that religion is concerned with unknown forces. Religion is not concerned with unknown forces; it is concerned with known forces. You can magnify as much as you like the element of mystery in religion, but in your actual commitments, in your actual behavior, you give your loyalty to something concrete, actual, human, and not to something abstract or unknown.

Our problem, then, is to attempt to find a meaning for the word spiritual in keeping with the liberal nature of our church, which we call the church of the free spirit. What we want is an inclusive meaning for this word, and we can have it if we keep close to our thinking that well-known Greek maxim: "Nothing human is foreign to me?

The spiritual is always a particular function of the mind of man, a peculiar and unique mode of behavior of the brain of man. We always meet the spiritual in man, in the religious giants of the race. Outside of its incarnation in men, what the spiritual may mean I frankly do not know and prefer to remain agnostic. The very fact that we speak of religious giants or world teachers implies that there is something in us which responds to their teaching. That is to say, there is spiritual kinship between the outstanding leaders of mankind, and the rest of us who are content to live in our workaday world. But we are all potentially spiritual, and the spiritual is therefore an emergent quality in the vast evolutionary process of life on this earth. It is difficult to define precisely this emergent quality, but perhaps the words of Whitehead, will give us an inkling of its meaning: There is something here "which stands beyond, behind, and within the passing flux of immediate things; something which is real, and yet waiting to be realized; something that gives meaning to all that passes, and yet eludes apprehension; something whose possession is the final good, and yet is beyond all reach."

Just what this something is, we do not know and possibly can never know. But there is no question that we see the emergence of this process in the blazing light of the human spirit, when that light lives intensely a universal quality.

This blazing light of some human quality enables us to reach the very center of the meaning of the spiritual. And we can say this: the spiritual is that peculiar mode of behavior of the human spirit in which a man lives so intensely a quality of life that we no longer know whether he lives in this quality, or this quality lives in him. There, in so far as we can make out, is the real meaning of the term spiritual, that intense quality of life, that close union between the quality and the man who lives it that we can never perceive the man apart from the quality he incarnates, or the quality apart from the man. The quality of life and the person who lives it are completely mingled, suffused in indestructible unity. Whenever this way of life takes place in a human being, a blazing personality results through the attainment of this intense, ideal, and harmonious living quality which shines with the peak of glorious human achievement. This is the spiritual quality in man, the blazing light of the human spirit.

We can see this light in Jesus as he set his face like flint toward Jerusalem, and spent hours of agony before his death. We can see it in the Buddha who left the purple to which he was born to live among the poor of his kingdom. We can see it in Albert Schweitzer who gave himself to the unlettered natives of Africa. These are familiar examples for the meaning of spiritual quality. But here are some illustrations which are not so familiar.

We can see the spiritual also in Shakespeare, for the light of his spirit was precisely the fullest portrayal of every mood of man, from dejection to exaltation, from crime to virtue. And, shall we add, we can see it too

in Karl Marx who was hounded from Germany to France, then from France to Belgium, and finally from Belgium to England where he spent years and years of patient study in the British Museum in an endeavor to discover relationships between the spiritual life of man and material, economic conditions. Do you think that there was no blazing light of spirituality in the life of Karl Marx? His millions of followers would testify that there is, that he really found the economic and social setting out of which spiritual qualities can rise for the whole human race.

It would be easy to multiply examples of this spiritual quality, but enough have been given to illustrate the meaning of this term spiritual. In all of these giants, Jesus, Buddha, Schweitzer, and Karl Marx, we see a light of blazing intensity in their spirit—the intensity of the devotion to the work which was theirs—and this light of their spirit illumines their existence and ours.

Whenever we see this light, our minds respond with a peculiar feeling. Our souls are touched and we feel drawn to these qualities and to these great personalities. And we are then ashamed of our shortcomings, of our laxity, of our complacency, and of our unworthiness. This blazing light of the human spirit penetrates into every darkness, and condemns us for the darkness we have caused. At the same time it takes hold of us, it seizes us, it upholds us, and it demands our utter loyalty. For this is the essential meaning of the word spiritual for us, the fact that in our moments of doubt, of despair, of bewilderment in this complex world of ours with all its tensions and difficulties, we *are* sustained, we *are* nourished by these masters of the art of life who incarnated so intensely a quality of life, that they and this quality become one harmonious action, one spirit, and one flame. And in our loyalty to these masters of the human spirit, we find our highest life.

For religion, you know, is not merely rationalism, not merely reading a book on philosophy or science. Religion reaches out to your whole nature, rational, scientific, literary, emotional, and instinctive, and claims the whole of your life for its ideal ends. All too often we have felt in the Unitarian Church that religion is merely examining at our leisure old doctrines, and then discarding them, and then sitting down proudly and quietly in the spirit of bourgeois complacency. We have forgotten that this attitude is a mere travesty of religion. Religion is nothing less than man's eternal witness to the flame of the human spirit, as we see it in the spiritual giants who lived intensely and yet harmoniously qualities of love, good will, compassion, justice, so that we are healed by the light of that flame, and find our souls renewed by the love, the good will, the compassion and the justice which overflow from these centers of spiritual energy. And the task of a really liberal church is to be the eternal witness to this flame of the human spirit, which no theology, no church doctrine, not even one religion, can adequately comprehend.

But there is something more in religion than the flame of the human spirit. There is a cosmic dimension in religion. Theologies have of course attempted to present this cosmic dimension, but they have quite often failed miserably. By the cosmic dimension of religion I mean this: Whenever we are moved by the blazing light of a spiritual giant, we are inevitably impressed by the thought that in some way the universe has produced this spiritual giant. We may not know in just what way, but we know that it has come through the natural process of evolution. In some way which we do not understand completely as yet, the non-living matter of the universe has evolved into living matter, and this living matter has evolved into the flame of the human spirit which is religion. The religious feeling is therefore that peculiar feeling or response of our minds which perceives in one flash, in one intense experience, both the spiritual person and the cosmos out of which it has come. And our response becomes particularly intense and essentially religious when we feel that in some vital sense the universe is involved in the creation and evolution of the heights of the human spirit. Or again, that the universe is disturbed whenever some unjust or inhuman action takes place.

An illustration of this latter experience which has always struck me as being particularly apt is that given by Dr. John Haynes Holmes when discussing the imprisonment of Tom Mooney. You may recall that Tom Mooney, a labor leader, was imprisoned in California under a miscarriage of justice. At the beginning of the war, in 1917, when the popular press was filled with hysterical headlines, as it is sometimes filled now, Tom Mooney was arrested on a trumped-up charge and perjured testimony. And then for over fifteen years civil liberties committees and labor defense leagues, and even churches, began to take action to secure Mooney's release. But there was one reaction to this case which is particularly instructive from the standpoint of our attempt to define the meaning of the word spiritual. The Reverend John Haynes Holmes wrote something like this: "This imprisonment of Tom Mooney is a gross miscarriage of justice"; and now note what he added: "it disturbs the planets in their courses and the universe must strive till it is whole again." Here in this impassioned utterance connecting a forceful feeling of justice with the universe, we see in its purest quality the essential religious consciousness, the union of a human quality with the cosmos out of which it has come, and this union perceived in one flash of experience.

It is this cosmic background which provides the canvas, the perspective, for a religious quality in life. It may be observed in many ways, in many situations. One may feel a great admiration for a distinguished scientist, such as Pasteur or the Curies, but in order that one may become truly religious, one must be moved by the quality of selfless devotion in these scientists and perceive this quality as an emergent product of the cosmos.

Again, a person may stand in wonder and awe before a great painting. But in order that this person may experience a truly religious feeling, he must be moved by the blazing light of perfect artistry in the mind of the painter, and also moved by the fact that this perfect technique and rendition is an emergent product of the cosmos.

Or again, a Socialist or a Communist may be devoted to the ideal of a cooperative world order, or a classless society, but this Socialist or Communist becomes in the fullest sense religious when he feels a peculiar kinship with all the reformers who have incarnated in their lives devotion to justice; and when he adds onto this feeling the sense that this devotion for a classless society is an emergent product of the universe.

Now we can draw our threads together and conclude what we have attempted to say about the meaning of the word spiritual.

First of all, it refers to a human quality, to a quality of life which is universal, with which we have kinship.

Secondly, it refers to this quality of life as deeply infused in the career of a person, so that this person and

the quality exemplified become fused into one single reality. Then this single reality blazes with the terrific light of the human spirit and removes the darkness from our souls.

Thirdly, we link up this intense exemplification of a quality with the universe out of which it has come, and we feel ourselves called upon to give our loyalty to the person, to the quality exemplified, and to the universe, all in one inclusive emotional experience. It is this experience, this inclusive emotional experience which is religion. It transcends the limitations of theology, creedalism, ecclesiasticism. It even transcends the limitations of any religion, and of our familiar separation between the religious and the secular. It unites in itself the highest aspects of both the religious and the secular.

1946: The Grand Epilogue of Our Age

DAVID JOBMAN

Millions of young men are now being returned to the pursuits of peaceful living with hearts pressed by apprehensions and hopes. The unspoken words of our departed Commander-in-Chief come to mind: "But the mere conquest of our enemies is not enough. We must go on to do all in our power to conquer the doubts and the fears, the ignorance and the greed, which made this horror possible." Now our younger children want to know what it was all about, and what they are to expect in their own immediate future. Are they to become victims of an atomic era of self-destruction, or are they to grow up in a world of justice, security, and lasting peace? They have read in their textbooks and have heard from their parents—some veterans of two World Wars—that only a little over a quarter of a century ago we were also fighting a global war to make this same world safe for Democracy, with a capital "D"; and, having crushed the enemy and won that war, we discovered to our universal sorrow that this world was made safe for Nazis and Fascists, whose joint lust for power forced us into this frightful holocaust of World War II. Are we really doing our utmost to save our children from a repetition of such woeful mistakes? What are the vital lessons of these trying times?

The second World War has left the indelible impression that isolationism is unworkable as a policy and impossible as a reality. What actually happened and what may happen in the near future in a Munich, Tokyo, Helsinki, Vladivostok, or any one of the distant and now unknown cities in the Baltic, the Balkans, the Middle and Far East, not to mention any of the countries in the Western Hemisphere, is of as vital concern to us and to our children in these United States as the doings in our immediate neighborhoods. Let us recall for a moment—on June 28, 1914, a pistol shot was fired in the small town of Sarajevo, in little Serbia, and twenty-nine nations had to muster for bloody combat 22,000,000 men under the flags of Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, and Bulgaria on one side, and another total of 42,000,000 men on the opposite side, under the flags of the Allies; resulting in a combined casualty list of 13,000,000 dead—with 198,000 American sons dead and another 198,000 wounded among them. It followed a solitary pistol shot which was fired by an unknown patriot in a little town of remote Serbia! Again, an unsuccessful infamous deal or maneuver was concocted in 1938, in Bavaria, in the city of Munich, with Chamberlain acting as godfather; and behold the conflagration of World War II was set ablaze, devouring cities, countries, continents. And this came to pass despite the fact that every throb of the human heart, every prayer on the mother's lips has but one theme: Mankind is one; no matter where you are and no matter what your idiom or belief, each and all, *we are our brothers' keepers,* if we are to escape the role of executioners and grave-diggers.

Isolationism is unthinkable. In times of peace, the human race has tasted too much of the freedom and sweetness of unifying adventure and scientific progress and will never allow itself to be pushed back behind the cloister walls and limitations of pious hope and wishful thinking. The radio, the press, the ocean superliners, and huge airships will not permit it; it simply cannot be done. Modern inventions, diffusion of knowledge, universal literacy, and rising standards of living make this unity of mankind a most welcome sign of better and saner days to come. In times of war, isolationism is most disastrous in its consequences. "In any future war," warned the President of the United States in an appeal to a joint session of Congress, "the heart of the United States would be the enemy's first target. Our geographical security is now gone—gone with the advent of the robot bomb, the rocket, aircraft carriers, and modern airborne armies." It required a Pearl Harbor to convince the most skeptical and wary that isolationism is unworkable as a policy and impossible as a reality.

We have also learned from the depredations of this global conflict that, if the human race is to survive under a semblance of civilization, the twin scourge of imperialism and militarism must be banished from this earth. Imperialism—the territorial expansion and conquest by force and subjugation of other peoples and cultures—has been the cause of more misery and bloodshed than a good many other evils combined, which are too many to enumerate. There is no nation under the sun, in modern times, fit to govern another; more so, if the former's citizens profess a philosophy which pays homage to the dignity of man, sacredness of human life, and who themselves are laboring to reduce to a minimum the man-made unjust distinctions which scatter the seeds of disunity and strife on the superficial grounds of color, creed, or caste. The Anglo-Saxon aspirations for political freedom, economic opportunity, and social equity, if not real equality, are now well understood in Asia, in Africa, and among the human remnants of ruined and butchered Europe, just as they are taken for granted as self-evident truths in London and in our own American town halls.

What militarism and war have meant to our world is too obvious a monstrosity to require explanation. It will be sufficient to heed one of our own great military commanders, whose devotion to our way of living and whose tactical genius has made possible our victory over the Nazi-Fascist plague which nearly destroyed the last hope of survival and decency. Said General Dwight D. Eisenhower, addressing a joint session of Congress on June 18, 1945:

My sorrow is not only for the fine young lives lost or broken, but it is equally for the parents, the wives, and the friends who have been bereaved. The price they paid is possibly the greatest. The blackness of their grief can be relieved only by the faith that all this shall not happen again!

No peace-loving people will condone the crimes of militarism; and in a civilization of "atomic dilemmas" the entire race is converted into herds of guinea pigs—which is far from the desires and aspirations of most of our public and private professions.

All peace-loving nations agree that, whether they label their faith in accord with the Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence, the Fourteen Points, or the Atlantic Charter, now they all must mean the same, namely, *liberty and justice for all.* Militarism wants nothing of either. Modern civilization points with pride to the Ten Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount, the Protestant Reformation, and the Great Revolutions which have abolished slavery and tyranny in their various shapes and forms; and these great accomplishments simply repeat one story—that the great masses of humanity the world over are determined to be free. Imperialism and militarism must give place to the popular will of an awakened humanity set to create a world order, guaranteeing a just and abiding world peace—to make room for a world "in which Nazism, Fascism, and military aggression cannot exist," as President Truman made clear in his memorable Navy Day address at Central Park. To make such a world possible, both imperialism and militarism must be uprooted, never to sprout again.

In the light of current history and from the point of view of American sacrifices and contribution that made this victory over Nazi and Fascist aggression possible, what was it that we were fighting for? From the angle of our participation, World War II has a definite lesson which the post-war statesmen and world at large must learn to remember—an interpretation which found its classic and official summary in President Roosevelt's successor's report to the nation on August 9, 1945. "Our victory in Europe," explained President Truman in his radio broadcast, "was more than a victory of arms. It was a victory of an ideal founded on the rights of the common man, on the dignity of the human being, and on the conception of the State as the servant—not the master—of his people." Imperialism and militarism must give way to a united world effort that would create those basic conditions that will make a just and lasting peace possible.

The third rather painful lesson emerging out of the ruins of our martyred generation is that ecclesiastical smugness and bias, tinged by a lust for power and dogmatic totalitarianism, must atone for the many crimes of omission and commission which have contributed so much to the sum total of strife and confusion of minds for the past ten centuries. According to pre-war figures, out of a total world population nearing the two billion mark, more than 34 per cent, or 639,000,000 souls, were credited with being professing Christians. Is it conceivable that true Christians would ever have permitted those frequent slaughters of the innocents climaxing in global holocausts? Do we really and sincerely know our faiths? One cannot honestly believe in the glory of the Son of man, the Prince of Peace, and lover of human brotherhood, and at the same time aid and give comfort to policies and practices which set man against man, neighbor against neighbor, people against people, and nation against nation. True religion cannot be made to thrive upon a sea of planted bayonets, torture chambers, and firing squads. Was the trust not violated by those ecclesiastical guardians of our youth, throughout the world, whose duty it was to instill those mental and spiritual qualities which make it impossible for injustice and bigotry to ravage their lives?

Religion cannot be divorced from social life and moral obligation; it cannot be separated from the political and economic and social institutions of a people. We may recall with profit George Washington's prayer for the United States, wherein our first President fully mirrored the aspirations of a truly religious life, seeking to "entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another," asking Divine Providence "to dispose us all to do justice, to love mercy and to demean ourselves with that charity, humility and pacific temper of mind which were the characteristics of the Divine Author of our blessed religion, and without a humble imitation of whose example in these things we can never hope to be a happy nation." Our first President fully felt that religion, in its very essence, was meant to unite, to enlighten, to heal and to comfort; it undertook to penetrate the mysteries of a life yet unexplained and labored to find answers, in line with mental growth, to perplexing questions. Its efforts were always the urge to assist man in his upward climb—out from the jungle towards a nobler and more beautifully enlightened plane. The very word religion, if it originates from the Latin *religare,* signifies to bind, to hold together. And what can be held in closer union than the universal brotherhood of mutually respecting and mutually assisting men and women?

Religion itself, as it was understood and practiced by the great founders of the world's sublimest systems, is a way of daily living and striving, where the rational being is ever one step ahead of the beast. In the very light of the aspirations and martyrdom of the outstanding founders and followers of the world's greatest religions, their belief always expressed the urge for world solidarity to be based on world unity, world peace, true friendliness, full justice, and an ever-expanding mutual helpfulness for the common weal. The founders of our faiths never condoned bigotry, persecution, oppression; nor did they practice brutal force or servility. Not in vain, and in the noble tradition of the Nazarene, is the warning and timely reminder of Archbishop Francis J. Spellman, given at a solemn assembly gathered at the Polo Grounds under the auspices of the Holy Name Society, for us to "guard America and ourselves against hatreds, falsehoods, bigotry and intolerance, for they are the seeds from which sprung the curse of this world's worst war and which, sown again, will toll the end of civilization."

A living religion and true followers will see to it that no evil seeds take root to plague future generations of man. Only thus can we fulfill the promise of the Atlantic Charter that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want. The spokesmen of religion have now the opportunity of a lifetime, which they can ill afford to miss. In truth, who can speak with greater authority and gain wider confidence than the disciples of the Prince of Peace who pleaded in such unmistakable terms for the Fellowship of Mankind erected upon the foundation of world peace and universal justice? In brief, "the ethical ideals of religion must now be translated into the realities of world law and order, economic justice, and racial brotherhood";

and by doing so the very destiny of man can be moved from the abyss of despair to a new life of greater and nobler achievement.

Finally, this bloody holocaust of 1939-1945 forced to the fore the great truth that Soul Force and the pen are still mightier than the sword. Mankind at large has been taught the lesson that crime in any form does not pay and that the mere wielding of force does not guarantee anything. The Romans had a word for it: *Violenta non durant.* The terror-striking panzer divisions, the death-spitting air armadas, the V-1 and V-2 robot projectiles created by the evil genius of Nazi aberration,—they all went to nil when met by the superior force of the free nations of the world. Now, in the wake of the weeping and gnashing of teeth, we discover that even the victors must seek aid from the schoolmaster and the spiritual giants of mankind.

This second World War has taught the victor that it takes moral regeneration, social justice, economic opportunity, and "spiritual recrudescence" to maintain that altar of freedom which has been our own national pride and heritage from the very birth of our nation, in 1776. That this lesson is well understood the world over is evidenced by timely elucidation of this very theme by Great Britain's new Prime Minister, who, speaking as a guest of the American Congress in Washington, stressed "the tragic folly of war" and lamented "the emotional condition in which war is possible." In his appeal, Prime Minister Attlee said:

> Man's material discoveries have outpaced his moral progress. The greatest task that faces us today is to bring home to all people, before it is too late, that our civilization can only survive by the acceptance and practice in international relations and in our national life of the Christian principle—we are members one of another.

To conclude, this grand epilogue of our age brings us closest to the realization that "free and humanly responsible creative activity" must be made possible for world-wide emulation and enjoyment; that we Americans, among all the nations of the world, are peculiarly fitted for world moral leadership, for we have deliberately dedicated ourselves as a people to the maintenance of certain positive modes of thinking and daily living which the United Nations must learn freely to accept and to practice, if they are to survive. They, too, must recognize "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just power from the consent of the governed. . . ." Man's socio-economic, political, and religious needs and aspirations must be revaluated in the light of these self-evident universal truths. For only by a devout and fearless re-dedication and application toward their materialization the world over can we hope to save our children from the curse of war and make it possible for the family of nations to live and prosper in friendship, security, and abundance, with liberty and full justice shared in full measure by all. Can it be done? In the immortal words of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the United Nations must rejoin: We can, we will, we must!

The Study Table

Man's Ultimate Challenge

THE MEANING OF HUMANISM. *By Curtis W. Reese. Boston: Beacon Press. 53 pp. $1.00.*

A number of reviewers, eager to square their accounts with Humanism, have accepted the opportunity which this book affords to launch some of their heaviest attacks. Moreover, they have found a few vulnerable spots and they have aimed their criticisms with telling effect; but they have to a large degree missed the central purpose of *The Meaning of Humanism.*

Dr. Reese obviously did not undertake, here, to round out or complete what he has to say on so inclusive and crucial a subject. If he had done that—and confined himself to 53 short pages—the slings and arrows of outraged critics might very well have been justified. We will revert briefly to a few debatable points, later. Meanwhile, the author undertakes, almost in dictionary fashion, "to show the meaning of Humanism" as he understands and accepts the term.

Is Humanism a religion? Those steeped in traditional Christianity, or even mildly under its influence, will answer categorically, "No!" Dr. Reese here answers categorically, "Yes!" We may, however, allow him to speak for himself:

> Religion, despite varying forms and expressions, is the commitment of oneself to the finding and living of the kind of life that is inherently desirable in the light of man's basic needs and aspirations. . . . I have here described religion in substantially the same terms as those used to describe Humanism. It is my position that there is not in fact a separate religious attitude, but that religion is organic to all Humanist attitudes.

As such "a way of life" Humanism has its roots deep and far back in history. It was foreshadowed by the early Greeks with Protagoras' assertion that "man is the measure of all things." Its spirit touched early Christianity itself: "He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" There is next the Humanism—such as it was—of the Renaissance, and later that of the Enlightenment. This thread leads through to the French philosopher, Comte and to America's John Dewey. From him, in turn, the American Humanists—largely under the leadership of Curtis Reese himself—have carried it forward, giving it once again a religious expression.

Humanism stresses the uniqueness of each person's outlook and the continuing evolutionary change and/or development of all living things. Repeatedly it calls attention to man's intelligence and the physical resources available to him as he seeks to control the materials of his natural world for his own ends. Ethically, Humanism is frankly experimental, tentative, relativistic. It undertakes to judge conduct in terms of contribution to the fulfillment of man's needs and aspirations. Always the author comes back to man standing, as it were, at the center of his universe and accepting the responsibility which is solely his because it cannot be delegated to some super "Other."

There is always the danger, of course, that in a statement so brief as this, Humanism will become narrowed down by its own terms and cause itself to be misunderstood. Nor can it be said that Dr. Reese has escaped the danger. When, for example, he says that "the Humanist . . . is not likely to speculate unduly on either the beginning or the end of things cosmic," his critics are quick to pounce on what they have always regarded as Humanism's most fatal weakness. It has long been

a cause for moral outrage among theists that Humanists are not interested in their universe, or that they are emotionally unresponsive to it. Those who know Curtis Reese know very well that he is guilty of neither of these "crimes" against high religion; and yet such statements dropped here and there give unnecessary cause for attack.

One could make a strong defense for the claim that it is precisely the Humanist, or let us call him the empirical naturalist, who would pry deeper and deeper into the mysteries and wonders of our natural world, and lose himself completely in the project. And is there any reason why he should not write greater poetry, compose more stirring music, and paint more glorious pictures because of it? Could the poet, Shelley, by any chance be included among those who—unwittingly perhaps—have espoused the religion of Humanism?

The difficulty with so small a book—urgently though a clarification of the term Humanism was called for—is that every sentence and every paragraph literally cries out for elaboration. One can find on every page a sentence which should be expanded into a paragraph, or a page, or another book. It is to be hoped that Dr. Reese himself will undertake the larger task. The human enterprise in the midst of our cosmic infinitude is the greatest of all enterprises with which man is concerned. It is his all-inclusive enterprise. Moreover, it is impossible to see how any ancient religious tradition —be it Christian or Hindu or Confucian—can ever hope to enter into a great world unity without being first thoroughly humbled, disciplined, and purged by its requirements.

The world is not done with Humanism. Every ancient tradition, every supernaturalistic scheme of salvation, will still feel its shattering impact; and we all owe Curtis Reese a debt of gratitude for once again bringing us face to face with its relentless and thrilling implications.

EDWIN T. BUEHRER.

Gloomy and Foreboding

SCIENCE, LIBERTY AND PEACE. *By Aldous Huxley. New York: Fellowship Publications. 86 pp. 50 cents.*

This book is described on the cover as "a thoughtful analysis of the individual today and his future in the world." Mr. Huxley's thoughts are gloomy and foreboding. He has no faith in the common man. He paints him as a moronic, pre-adolescent following one adolescent gang leader after another. He finds no indication that mankind might mature. He objects to the rule of minorities and yet his main solution for our ills is for another minority, the scientists, to change their ways.

If one followed the logic of Huxley's analysis it would be necessary to return to the spinning wheel society of family self-sufficiency. Technological and scientific progress is to him only a more powerful implement of exploitation and suppression. His lack of faith in man blinds him to the great historical trends toward an ever-expanding cooperation between men. He gives little, if any, recognition to the growing desire for and practice of freedom, reason, and tolerance. He is so appalled by the ghastliness of the war and the immensity of postwar problems that all he has left is a pessimistic faith in an inexorable God.

One would recommend to Mr. Huxley and those who follow his pessimism that they read Carl Friederick's *A New Faith in the Common Man* and Prof. H. N. Wieman's article, "Emerging Conflicts of Faith" (UNITY, October-November, 1945, p. 120).

RANDALL S. HILTON.

The Field

(*Continued from page 50*)

frenzied destruction.

At first glance, this may appear to be a hopeless task for women, undertaken in desperation at the zero hour; but swift action—the involuntary yet wise steps any mother takes to protect her child in time of danger—may save civilization.

First: Every woman must demand, by letters and by telegrams to her government leaders, that qualified women be appointed as delegates to every international conference, and as members of every international committee. She should submit carefully-selected names of such representatives in voicing her demands, calling preferably upon the experience of internationally-minded women's groups to guide her.

Second: She must become a self-appointed Committee-of-One to watch, eagle-eyed, every pending bill, every proposal for new controls, national or international in impact, suggested by her legislators. The acid tests of her acceptance or rejection should be: Will it benefit the greatest number of people or will it benefit merely the interests of a selfish group? Will it promote the principles of human decency, justice, and universal brotherhood, without prejudice on the basis of nationality, race, color, religion, sex, or economic status? Will it generate good will in the community of nations or will it create distrust and suspicion? Whether or not a woman belongs to an organized group, she must write or telegraph approval or disapproval immediately to her Congressmen, her state legislator, her alderman, her selectman. She cannot afford to assume someone else will do the job for her, any more than she can assume that her neighbor will turn in the fire alarm when *her* house catches fire.

Third: She must consider herself a missionary to spread the gospel of global citizenship within her own sphere of influence, every hour of every day.

Fourth: She must acquaint herself by every means at her disposal—newspapers, magazines, books, and the radio, and in daily human contact with the customs, traditions, history, and problems of her world neighbors.

Fifth: She must become an active member of some organization which is dedicated to the principles of collective security and has links with women in other countries.

Victor Hugo once wrote: "No army can withstand the strength of an idea whose time has come." The Idea is the strong chain of womanhood around the world which can be forged through friendship and mutual support to insure a lasting peace; and the Time is NOW.

To this end, the National Council of Women of the United States, Inc., proposes the following as a rule of conduct that every woman, everywhere, may adopt:

> I shall do all that lies in my power to fulfill the responsibilities of good citizenship in a world community: (1) by urging the active participation of qualified women in local, state, national, and international government; (2) by using my ballot, always, for the benefit of the greatest number; (3) by protesting immediately to my government against any encroachment upon the human rights and fundamental freedoms of my global neighbors, anywhere; (4) by demonstrating in my home and my community, my firm belief in the precept of human brotherhood as the foundation of a lasting world peace.
>
> This is the program I gladly adopt as the minimum of my obligation to society; but I shall seek, constantly, other ways of strengthening the hands of men and women of good will everywhere for the betterment of the human race—so help me God.

Adopted by the Executive Committee of the National Council of Women of the United States, Inc.,
501 *Madison Ave., New York* 22, *N.Y.*

Western Conference News

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

APPEAL SUCCESS

The United Unitarian Appeal went over the top this year for the first time since its organization. Seeking to raise $231,000, the largest sum it has set as a goal, the Appeal closed its books with total receipts of $240,-400. Each participating organization is assured of 100 per cent of its allotment. The Western Conference has already received its full amount of $4,500.

The success of the appeal was made possible through the devoted efforts of the local churches. It had been our hope to publish in this issue of UNITY the complete list of Western Conference churches that exceeded their quota. However, the final figures will not be ready for a few days. A complete report will be given as soon as possible.

Many thanks go to the churches, ministers, and individuals who worked so faithfully on the Appeal.

CORRECTION

In the May issue of UNITY it was reported that eight hundred people attended the Easter services at People's Church, Chicago. The number should have been EIGHT THOUSAND. Dr. Bradley held four services on Easter Sunday.

ST. LOUIS RECORD

There were nine delegates in attendance at the May Meetings in Boston, May 19-24, from the church in St. Louis. As far as we are able to learn this was the largest delegation outside of New England.

A.U.A. BOARD MEMBERS

Dr. E. Burdette Backus, Indianapolis, was elected Regional Vice-President of the American Unitarian Association at the annual meeting in May. Dr. Backus succeeds Dr. Curtis W. Reese in this position.

Dr. Julius E. Warren, of the St. Louis church, was elected to a term of three years. Dr. Warren at the time of his nomination was Commissioner of Education for Massachusetts and lived in Newton. However, at the time of his election he was living in University City, St. Louis County, Missouri, where he is Superintendent of Schools.

Other Western Conference persons on the Board of the Association holding over are Rev. Raymond B. Bragg, Minneapolis, and Dr. Thaddeus B. Clark, St. Louis.

MRS. MORAN RESIGNS

We regret to announce that Mrs. Charles H. Moran, of St. Louis, has found it necessary to give up her many positions of leadership in our movement. These include the A.U.A. Board, the Western Conference Board, and the chairmanship of the Lake Geneva Summer Assembly. We look forward to the time when she can resume her active participation in our larger work. We wish her and her family the best of health and happiness, and extend our thanks to them for all they have done.

MINISTERS AT MAY MEETINGS

While at the May Meetings in Boston Mr. Hilton met the following ministers of Western Conference churches.

E. Burdette Backus, Indianapolis, Indiana.
Merrill O. Bates, Grosse Pointe, Michigan.
John Nicholls Booth, Evanston, Illinois.
Raymond B. Bragg, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
Thaddeus B. Clark, St. Louis, Missouri.
Arthur Foote, St. Paul, Minnesota.
Aron S. Gilmartin, Ft. Wayne, Indiana.
Arthur R. Graham, Sioux City, Iowa.
Robert S. Hoagland, People's Liberal, Chicago.
Harold P. Marley, Dayton, Ohio.
Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., Rockford, Illinois.
R. Lester Mondale, Kansas City, Missouri.
Arthur W. Olsen, Toledo, Ohio.
Kenneth L. Patton, Madison, Wisconsin.
Leslie T. Pennington, First Church, Chicago.
Tracy M. Pullman, Detroit, Michigan.
Edward H. Redman, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
Philip Schug, Urbana, Illinois.
Kenneth C. Walker, Bloomington, Illinois.

Rev. Wallace W. Robbins, President of Meadville Theological School, gave the annual sermon on Sunday night, May 19. Dr. George Stoddard, President-elect of the University of Illinois, delivered the Ware Lecture on Wednesday night, May 22. Dr. Homer A. Jack, Director of the Chicago Council Against Racial and Religious Discrimination, was also present. He was formerly minister at Lawrence, Kansas.

U.M.U. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Unitarian Ministerial Union elected an Executive Committee, all members of which are ministers of churches in the Western Conference. This follows a policy of the Union to elect this committee from among men who can readily meet together for the purpose of conducting the business of the Union. This group can meet easily in either St. Louis or Chicago. The committee is composed of the following men.

President—Thaddeus B. Clark
Vice-Pres.—E. Burdette Backus
Sec'y-Treas.—Jack Mendelsohn, Jr.
John Nicholls Booth
Grant A. Butler
John G. Gill
R. Lester Mondale
Kenneth C. Walker

One of the first tasks of this committee is to select an editor for the Unitarian Ministerial Union *News-Letter* to succeed Randall S. Hilton who has been the editor for the past four years. The editor of the *News-Letter* also becomes a member of the Executive Committee.

WESTERN CONFERENCE

Summer Assembly—August 18 to 25—College Camp, Lake Geneva, Wisconsin